



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/759,845	01/12/2001	Pierre D. Grondin	PGI6044P0310US	1863

7590 10/03/2002
ROCKEY, MILNAMOW & KATZ, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza
Suite 4700
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, IL 60601

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

GUARIELLO, JOHN J

[REDACTED] ART UNIT [REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

1771

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2002

5-

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
691759845	Gruzdin et al.
Examiner	Group Art Unit
John Guarnella	1791

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- This action is FINAL.
- Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

- The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is approved disapproved.
- The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).
- All Some* None of the:
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received
in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 4 Interview Summary, PTO-413
- Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1771

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

15. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

16. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The instant specification describes **thickness** as “15-30 grams/square meter” but the units of grams/square meter are units of basis weight (see page 4, line 8; page 5, line 27; not units of thickness.

17. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1771

18. Claims 6, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 6, line 3, it is not clear what the correct thickness unit is, since “15-10 g/square meter” as stated in the claim, **g/square meter** is basis weight, not thickness unit. No clear support is found in the instant specification for this “thickness”.

In claim 12, line 2, it is not clear what the phrase “polymeric coating is in the range” encompasses since this “range” could be basis weight, or thickness, or some other parameter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

19. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1771

20. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doyle et al 6,133,168 in view of Lim et al. 5,308,691.

Doyle describes a coated substrate which can be polypropylene nonwoven fabric with a monolithic coated breathable polymer layer adhered to the substrate, (see abstract; column 1, lines 5-54). Doyle describes the breathable polymer layer is substantially impervious to liquid water but is highly permeable to water vapor, (column 3, lines 59-67). Doyle describes this coated substrate as corresponding to the claimed laminate. Doyle describes the breathable polymer coating as co-polyesters, acrylic polymers, polyethers, copolymers and blends thereof, (column 3, lines 60-67). Doyle is silent about the thickness, the spunbonded polypropylene, and the amounts of the components of the coating.

Lim describes a composite sheet corresponding to the claimed laminate, (see abstract). Lim describes the spunbonded polypropylene fiber sheet with high water vapor penetration which can be used for housewrap, (see abstract). Lim describes the basis weight of the spunbonded polypropylene is about 17-

Art Unit: 1771

100 g/ square meter which overlaps the amount in the claimed invention, (column 2, lines 49-51). Lim describes machine direction and crossdirection tensile strengths in Table 1, (column 6, lines 15-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the spunbonded polypropylene polymer fabric layer of Lim for the polypropylene fabric of Doyle motivated with the expectation that there would be improved air flow resistance and high water vapor transmission properties as evidenced by Lim column 6, lines 8-10. Regarding the amounts of the components of the breathable coating one of ordinary skill in this art would be able to optimize these parameters because the reference describe the basis chemistry and structure.

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John J. Guarriello whose telephone number is 703-308-3209. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8 am to 4 pm.

Art Unit: 1771

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris, can be reached on (703) 308-2414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-305-5408.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.


John J. Guarriello:gj
Patent Examiner

September 25, 2002


TERREL MORRIS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700